



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,824	02/20/2002	John Kam Ho Lee	FAIRBRN-06792	3088

7590 07/15/2004
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
Suite 350
101 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER
GOINS, DAVETTA WOODS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2632

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,824

Applicant(s)

HO LEE, JOHN KAM

Examiner

Davetta W. Goins

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vidovic (US Pat. 4,254,483) in view of Krajci (US Pat. 6,182,497 B1) in view of Nakajima et al. (US Pat. 6,094,143).

In reference to claims 1, 5, Vidovic discloses the claimed alarm panel connected to an event sensor via cable, and circuitry associated with the conductors for providing current to the event sensor and detecting changes in the current to indicate tampering at the sensor, severing of the cable and/or an event detected by the sensor, which is met by an ultrasonic intruder alarm comprising a processor 12 (control panel) connected to a plurality of receiver heads 18, used to detect a disturbance within an ultrasonic field (event sensor); a tamper detector, to detect tampering of one of the receiving heads 18 or of the cable; and a cut cable detector 110, used to determine whether the cable 20 has been cut (col. 8, lines 35-65). Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed cable comprising two conductors and the event sensor including two terminals. Krajci discloses a gas detection system including a gas detector 12 with cables 38 used for providing power to the detector; each cable may be a 4-conductor cable with two conductors being used for simplex data communications between gas detectors 12 and protocol

Art Unit: 2632

converters 20 and two conductors being used for the power supply (col. 4, lines 58-64).

Nakajima discloses a smoke sensor including a warning circuit 12 and voltage circuit 13 connected to two terminals 11a and 11b; the two terminals 11a and 11b also connected to the smoke sensor (col. 3, lines 46-64). Since Vidovic discloses an alarm system including a circuit and cable connecting the input, sensors, and output devices together, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of using a cable comprising two conductors, as disclosed by Krajci, and an event sensor comprising only two terminals, as disclosed by Nakajima, all with the system of Vidovic, as a choice of design that would ensure that sufficient amount of power will be provided to the event sensor no matter the length of the cable as well as using the terminals to determine when an alarm condition is being sensed.

3. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vidovic, in view of Krajci in view of Nakajima et al. as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Armstrong (US Pat. 4,554,411).

In reference to claims 2, 6, although Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed two-conductor cable extending and providing a short six-conductor cable for connection to an existing alarm control panel, he does disclose a cable 20 connecting the processor 12 (control panel) to the plurality of receiver heads 18 (event sensors) (col. 2, lines 57-68 and Figure 1).

Armstrong discloses an intercom system comprising a control unit 100 connected by a common six wire cable 104 to one or more inside remote units (col. 2, lines 64-68; col. 3, lines 1-19).

Art Unit: 2632

Since Vidovic discloses an alarm system in which a processor (control panel) is attached to a plurality of receiver heads 18 (event sensors) via cable 20, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of using a six-conductor cable, as disclosed by Armstrong, with the system of Vidovic, as a commonly known in the art cable that provides paired lines to each sensor as a design choice for allowing transmitting/receiving signals to and from the control panel.

In reference to claims 3, 7, Vidovic discloses the claimed circuitry reacting to the current state of the conductors to provide appropriate conditions to each conductor of the cable for recognition by the alarm control panel, which is met by the detected human intruder will provide a signal to drive alarm relay 166 to operate either annunciator 14 or remotely located alarm device; a tamper detector providing a signal upon detecting removal of cover to the receiving head and/or a signal generated on line 238; the cut cable detector 110 develops a signal causing operation of LED 122, both the cut cable and tamper detector 112 will cause operation of LED 122, ect. (col. 8, lines 35-68). Although Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed shorting of the cable providing a maximum current state, an event detection by the sensor providing a medium current state, normal operating conditions providing a low current state, a severed cable or tampering with the event sensor providing a very low or no current state, he does disclose a cable connected from the processor 12 (control panel) to each receiver head 18 (event detectors), signals transmitted and received on the cable determine the alarm condition (col. 3, lines 6-68; col. 4, lines 1-68; col. 5, lines 1-58). Since Vidovic discloses a processor used for detecting various signals transmitted on cable 20 to determine which alarm has taken place, it would have been

Art Unit: 2632

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use any level of current or voltage provided to represent a tamper, event sensor, or cut cable, to ensure that the control panel will issue the correct alarm.

In reference to claims 4, 8, although Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed even sensor is a passive infra-red detector, he does disclose the head receivers 18 comprised of ultrasonic sensors (col. 2, lines 57-68). Since it is well known in the art to use various types of sensors to detect intrusion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a passive infra-red detector with or in place of Vidovic's sensors, as a means to provide a warning signal upon determining a disturbance within a specified field.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davetta W. Goins whose telephone number is 703-306-2761.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri with every other Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on 703-308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/081,824

Page 6

Art Unit: 2632

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-7666.



D.W.G.

July 9, 2004

Davetta W. Goins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2632